The Ethics of Signing Weapons of War: A Reflection on Symbolism, Responsibility, and the Pursuit of Peace

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvn.com

October 10, 2024

The act of signing weapons of war, such as artillery shells, is a practice that dates back to World War I, when soldiers and civilians alike personalized munitions with messages. Historically, it has been used as a way to boost morale, humanize industrial warfare, and demonstrate solidarity with comrades in battle. However, this tradition has resurfaced in contemporary conflicts, raising significant ethical concerns. The recent event of Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro signing artillery shells for Ukraine during a visit with President Volodymyr Zelenskyy reignited this debate. While intended as a show of support, such gestures risk glorifying violence and desensitizing the public to the human cost of war. This paper explores the ethical implications of signing weapons, the symbolism it conveys, and the responsibility of leaders to promote peace. By examining this practice within the context of modern warfare, we aim to challenge the normalization of violence and advocate for diplomatic solutions over destructive symbolism.

Keywords: ethics, symbolism of war, signing weapons, diplomacy, peace, Governor Josh Shapiro, Ukraine, artillery shells, moral responsibility, glorification of violence.

I. Introduction

The practice of signing weapons of war, such as artillery shells and bombs, is a symbolic tradition that dates back over a century. First recorded in World War I, soldiers and civilians alike began to personalize the lethal tools of war by inscribing messages, drawings, and signatures on munitions before they were launched at enemy forces. This practice was intended to boost morale among troops, add a personal touch to impersonal warfare, and, in some cases, mock the enemy. It continued through World War II, the Korean and Vietnam Wars, and into modern conflicts, although its meaning has evolved with time. While some saw it as a way to humanize warfare, others perceived it as a reflection of the inherent dehumanization that war brings.

In 2024, this historical practice found renewed attention when Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro signed 155mm artillery shells during a visit to the Scranton Army Ammunition Plant. This act took place in the presence of Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy, during a symbolic gesture of solidarity with Ukraine amidst its war with Russia. The Scranton plant, which plays a key role in producing critical munitions for Ukraine, became a focal point for this public show of support. Shapiro, in a widely shared video, wrote a message of solidarity on the shells, which were bound for Ukrainian forces fighting to defend their country against Russian aggression.

Shapiro's act, while intended as a gesture of support, sparked controversy both in political circles and on social media. Critics questioned the ethics of signing weapons of war, comparing the practice to trivializing lethal weapons by treating them like "sports memorabilia". Supporters viewed it as a continuation of a longstanding tradition of showing unity and support for soldiers on the front lines, particularly for those fighting in defense of their homeland.

The aim of this paper is to explore the ethical dilemmas inherent in signing weapons of war, examine the symbolic meaning behind such acts, and analyze the broader implications for conflict and the pursuit of peace. By delving into the historical roots of this practice, the public's reaction to Governor Shapiro's actions, and the ethical concerns it raises, this paper will argue against the glorification of violence and advocate for more peaceful and constructive symbols of solidarity. Through this analysis, we aim to question the messages conveyed by

such symbolic acts and call for a reevaluation of how political leaders choose to represent their support for conflict-stricken nations.

II. The Historical Practice of Signing Weapons

The practice of inscribing messages and signatures on weapons of war, particularly artillery shells and bombs, dates back to at least World War I. It arose as a form of personal expression in the midst of industrialized warfare, allowing soldiers and civilians alike to leave their mark on the otherwise mechanical and impersonal instruments of death. Over time, this tradition evolved, extending through various conflicts of the 20th and 21st centuries, including the Vietnam War and the ongoing conflict in Ukraine. While initially a morale-boosting act, signing weapons has raised ethical questions about its symbolic meaning, dehumanizing the enemy, and perpetuating the glorification of violence.

Origins in World War I and World War II

During World War I, trench warfare brought soldiers face-to-face with the grim realities of modern, mechanized conflict. As artillery and machine guns became the primary tools of war, the soldiers' role became increasingly detached from the personal engagement of battle. It was during this time that the practice of inscribing messages on artillery shells began. Soldiers would write short notes—ranging from personal messages to dark humor—on the shells being fired at enemy lines. These inscriptions could be as simple as "Good luck" or more aggressive taunts toward the enemy. Civilians working in munitions factories also joined in, signing shells as they were produced, sometimes adding patriotic slogans or notes of encouragement for the troops who would eventually use them.

World War II saw the continuation of this practice, particularly among bomber crews. Messages were frequently inscribed on bombs before they were dropped over enemy territory. These ranged from expressions of anger and revenge to more lighthearted quips meant to maintain morale in the face of the war's devastation. The signing of bombs, shells, and torpedoes became a symbol of solidarity among soldiers and factory workers alike, a way to personalize the vast and impersonal machinery of war. For many, it was a way to symbolically "own" a

part of the war effort, turning an otherwise distant form of combat into something with personal meaning.

The Shift to Modern Conflicts

As warfare evolved, so did the tradition of signing weapons. In the Vietnam War, the practice continued, though with a more bitter and cynical edge. The complexities of the war and the growing anti-war movement in the U.S. led to a shift in tone. Messages inscribed on bombs and shells often reflected the soldiers' frustrations and the emotional toll of a controversial war. The act of signing weapons, once seen as a simple morale booster, took on a more complex symbolic role, sometimes expressing soldiers' disillusionment with the conflict.

In recent years, this tradition has resurfaced, particularly in the context of the war in Ukraine. The conflict between Ukraine and Russia has seen significant foreign involvement, with countries like the U.S. and European nations supplying weapons to aid Ukraine's defense. Amidst this, the signing of artillery shells has once again become a symbolic gesture, as seen in the case of Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro's recent signing of 155mm shells bound for Ukrainian forces. This resurgence demonstrates the enduring appeal of the practice, though it also raises ethical questions about whether it is appropriate in modern warfare, where the human cost of conflict is more visible than ever due to media coverage and public scrutiny.

Symbolism and Morale

The act of signing weapons, particularly during the world wars, was largely seen as a way to boost morale. For soldiers, it provided a personal connection to the weapons they used, transforming the distant, mechanical act of warfare into something that felt more human and direct. This was especially important in wars like World War I and World War II, where the industrial scale of conflict often left soldiers feeling like small cogs in a vast war machine. By signing a shell or bomb, soldiers could feel as though they had a personal stake in the outcome of the battle.

For the civilians who produced these munitions, signing shells was a way to contribute to the war effort in a more personal way. Many factory workers would write messages of support or patriotism, and some saw the act as a small way of

connecting with the soldiers fighting overseas. In this way, signing weapons served as a bridge between the home front and the battlefield.

However, while the act of signing weapons was meant to humanize the war effort, it also contributed to the dehumanization of the enemy. By personalizing the shells aimed at enemy forces, soldiers and workers often engaged in a form of psychological warfare. The messages inscribed on bombs and shells were sometimes meant to mock or humiliate the enemy, reflecting the deep-seated animosities that war fosters. In this sense, the practice of signing weapons can be seen as both a way to humanize one's own side and dehumanize the opposing forces.

Conclusion

The historical practice of signing weapons, from World War I to contemporary conflicts, reflects the complex interplay between personal expression, morale, and the dehumanization of the enemy. While it may have once served as a morale booster and a way to humanize the industrialized machinery of war, its ethical implications are difficult to ignore. In modern conflicts, where the human cost of war is ever-present in global media, the act of signing weapons has come under increasing scrutiny. It raises important questions about the nature of symbolism in war and the fine line between solidarity and glorification of violence.

III. Governor Josh Shapiro's Act of Signing Artillery Shells

Details of the Event

On September 22, 2024, Pennsylvania Governor Josh Shapiro participated in an event at the Scranton Army Ammunition Plant, where he signed 155mm artillery shells in the presence of Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. This plant, located in Scranton, PA, plays a key role in producing munitions for Ukraine's defense forces as they fight against Russian aggression. The shells manufactured there, particularly the 155mm howitzer rounds, are critical to Ukraine's military strategy and are regularly supplied through U.S. military aid programs.

Shapiro's decision to sign the shells was intended as a public show of solidarity with Ukraine, symbolizing Pennsylvania's support for the Ukrainian people and

their struggle for sovereignty. The event highlighted both the manufacturing capacity of the U.S. and the direct role that Pennsylvania workers play in supporting international efforts. In the broader context, Shapiro's gesture reflected the ongoing U.S. military and economic aid to Ukraine, reaffirming America's stance in supporting Ukraine's defense.

Shapiro wrote a message of support for Ukraine on the shells, symbolically tying the state of Pennsylvania to the Ukrainian cause. He emphasized the importance of U.S. and Pennsylvania's contributions to global freedom, framing the defense of Ukraine as a battle for broader democratic values.

Public Reaction and Controversy

Shapiro's signing of artillery shells quickly garnered attention and stirred significant controversy. Social media reactions were mixed, with many users expressing discomfort and disapproval of what they saw as trivializing the lethality of weapons of war. Critics accused Shapiro of treating these weapons like "sports memorabilia" by signing them, a comparison that reflects concerns about the ethics of turning instruments of death into political or symbolic platforms.

Some commentators voiced outrage, arguing that it is inappropriate for political leaders to engage in such acts. They suggested that signing weapons, even in the name of solidarity, glorifies violence and contributes to the normalization of war. One common sentiment was that leaders should focus on peace-building efforts rather than participating in symbolic gestures that celebrate the instruments of warfare. Critics also pointed out the irony of advocating for freedom and human rights while signing weapons designed to kill.

On the other hand, some defenders of Shapiro's actions viewed the gesture as a continuation of a long-standing tradition of military support, framing it as a morale-boosting act akin to soldiers or factory workers in World War I and World War II inscribing messages on munitions. Supporters argued that Shapiro's act was not meant to trivialize the violence of war but to stand in solidarity with Ukrainian forces who are fighting for their country's survival against a much larger adversary.

Shapiro's Intended Message

Governor Shapiro's intended message was one of unity and support for the Ukrainian people during their time of need. By signing the artillery shells, he aimed to symbolize Pennsylvania's role in the global fight for democracy and freedom. The event was meant to highlight the contributions of Pennsylvania's workers and the strategic importance of the state's manufacturing industry in supplying vital resources to Ukraine. Shapiro framed his actions as a moral duty, echoing the broader U.S. position of defending Ukraine's sovereignty in the face of Russian aggression.

However, the public's interpretation of this gesture varied widely. For many, Shapiro's message was overshadowed by the symbolism of signing weapons that are designed to kill and destroy. While his intent was likely to show solidarity with a nation under siege, the act of signing a weapon—especially one that would be used in a war that has caused significant civilian suffering—was seen by some as distasteful. This contrast between Shapiro's intent and the public's interpretation highlights the complex symbolism attached to acts of war support and the fine line political leaders must walk when engaging in such gestures.

Conclusion

Governor Josh Shapiro's signing of artillery shells intended to support Ukraine sparked a broader debate about the ethics of symbolic acts in wartime. While his intended message was one of solidarity, public reactions underscored the controversial nature of engaging with the symbols of warfare. This incident raises critical questions about the role of political leaders in wartime symbolism and the implications such acts carry for the perception of war and peace.

IV. The Ethical Implications of Signing Weapons

The practice of signing weapons, such as artillery shells, raises significant ethical concerns about the normalization of violence, the impact on public perception, and the moral dissonance it creates in the context of advocating for peace while engaging in symbolic acts that glorify warfare. This section explores how the seemingly simple act of signing weapons distances individuals from the

consequences of war, desensitizes the public to its human cost, and creates inconsistencies in the pursuit of peace.

Normalization of Violence

The act of signing weapons, whether by soldiers, politicians, or civilians, serves to distance individuals from the destructive power of these tools of war. While the gesture may seem symbolic or even lighthearted, it risks turning the serious and deadly nature of warfare into something more abstract and ritualistic. By inscribing personal messages or signatures on artillery shells, those involved in the war effort reduce the weapon to a token or memento, detaching themselves from the real consequences—the killing and destruction that those weapons cause.

This normalization of violence is dangerous because it allows individuals to engage with the mechanisms of war without fully confronting the devastation that follows. The shells, bombs, and missiles bearing these signatures are not just objects; they are lethal instruments designed to maim, destroy, and kill. By personalizing them, the act obscures the fact that these weapons will inflict immense suffering on soldiers and civilians alike.

The ritualization of war through signing weapons contributes to an environment where violence becomes an accepted, even celebrated, solution to conflict. It encourages a mindset in which war is not viewed as the last resort but as a means of expressing solidarity, patriotism, or defiance. This, in turn, can erode the moral seriousness with which decisions about war and peace should be treated.

Impact on Public Perception

Public perception plays a crucial role in how acts of war, such as signing weapons, are interpreted. When political leaders or public figures sign artillery shells, it sends a message that violence is not only necessary but also something to be endorsed and even celebrated. This can desensitize the public to the human cost of conflict, leading to a culture where war is accepted as a normal part of international relations rather than a tragic failure of diplomacy.

The signing of weapons has often been framed as a morale-boosting gesture for those on the front lines or a show of solidarity with a particular cause. However, it also risks creating a disconnect between the reality of war and the symbolic

nature of these acts. When people see leaders or soldiers signing bombs, they may view the conflict in a more detached, impersonal way, reducing the suffering of those affected by the war to an abstract concept. The human cost—innocent lives lost, families destroyed, cities razed—fades into the background as the public becomes more focused on the political and symbolic narratives around the war.

The widespread use of social media in modern conflicts exacerbates this issue. Videos and images of signed weapons can quickly go viral, turning a private act into a public spectacle. This visibility can further desensitize viewers, especially younger generations, who may come to see war as something distant and glamorous rather than as a devastating event that destroys lives.

Moral Dissonance

Perhaps the most significant ethical concern surrounding the signing of weapons is the moral dissonance it creates, especially for leaders who advocate for peace. On the one hand, signing artillery shells or bombs is often framed as a show of support for troops or a symbol of solidarity with a nation fighting for its freedom. On the other hand, this act is inherently at odds with the principles of ethical governance and the pursuit of peace.

For leaders like Governor Josh Shapiro, who framed his signing of artillery shells as a way to support Ukraine in its defense against Russian aggression, there is a moral tension between promoting peace and engaging in symbolic acts that glorify war. Shapiro's intended message was one of solidarity, yet the act of signing weapons contributes to the broader narrative that violence and military force are the primary solutions to conflict. This creates a disconnect between the stated goals of promoting peace and the actions taken to support war.

This moral dissonance extends beyond individual leaders to the broader political systems that endorse such acts. Governments that support military aid to conflict zones often emphasize the need for peaceful resolutions, yet the act of signing munitions sends a conflicting message. It suggests that while peace is the ultimate goal, violence is an acceptable and even celebrated means of achieving it. This inconsistency undermines efforts to build a world where diplomacy and cooperation are valued over military force.

Moreover, the moral dissonance is exacerbated when the act of signing weapons is viewed through a lens of public perception. While the intent behind such gestures may be to show support for a noble cause, the optics of political leaders participating in the personalization of war machines can alienate those who believe in non-violent solutions. This alienation may deepen divisions within societies already struggling with the ethical implications of war and peace.

Conclusion

The ethical implications of signing weapons of war are far-reaching and complex. This practice normalizes violence, desensitizes the public to the human cost of conflict, and creates a troubling moral dissonance for leaders who advocate for peace. While the intent behind signing artillery shells may be to show solidarity or support, the broader consequences must be considered. Acts that glorify war, even indirectly, risk perpetuating cycles of violence and overshadowing efforts to find diplomatic solutions to conflicts. For leaders and societies committed to peace, it is crucial to reject symbols of violence and seek new ways to express support that do not undermine the ethical pursuit of peace.

V. War and Its Human Costs

War, by its very nature, is a tool of destruction that inflicts immense human suffering on soldiers, civilians, and societies as a whole. The physical, emotional, and psychological toll of conflict is profound, often leaving scars that endure for generations. In this section, we will explore the brutality of war, the contradiction of using symbols of war like signed artillery shells to pursue peace, and the critical role of leaders in promoting non-violent solutions over the glorification of conflict.

The Brutality of War

At its core, war is synonymous with destruction. The use of force to achieve political, territorial, or ideological goals results in widespread loss of life, displacement, and devastation of infrastructure. Modern warfare, in particular, with its technological advancements, has amplified the reach and intensity of destruction. Artillery shells, bombs, drones, and missiles can decimate entire communities in minutes, leaving behind nothing but rubble and loss.

For those directly impacted by war, the consequences are severe. Soldiers on the front lines face not only the risk of physical injury or death but also long-lasting psychological trauma. Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is a well-documented condition among veterans, manifesting through anxiety, nightmares, and flashbacks. Beyond the battlefield, civilians often bear the brunt of the violence. Cities and villages caught in the crossfire become war zones, with families losing their homes, loved ones, and access to essential services like healthcare and clean water. The suffering experienced by refugees, who are forced to flee their homes to escape violence, is a stark reminder of the human cost of war.

The devastation extends beyond physical harm. War disrupts education, destroys economies, and fractures communities. In conflict zones, children grow up in environments of fear and instability, often without access to proper schooling, healthcare, or emotional support. The true cost of war cannot be measured solely in terms of lives lost or buildings destroyed—it also includes the generational trauma and loss of opportunity that reverberates long after the fighting ends.

War as a Tool of Destruction, Not Peace

Given the profound destruction that war inflicts, the use of symbols of war, such as signing artillery shells, contradicts any true commitment to achieving long-term peace. The symbolism behind signing weapons, while intended to show solidarity with soldiers or a nation under siege, ultimately glorifies the tools of violence rather than encouraging the pursuit of non-violent solutions. When leaders participate in or endorse such acts, they inadvertently send the message that war is a viable and even honorable means of resolving conflict.

Supporting symbols of war can desensitize societies to the real consequences of violence. By turning weapons into objects of symbolism, the reality of the destruction they cause becomes abstract. This can lead to a dangerous normalization of military action as an acceptable and frequent solution to international disputes. In an age where technology has made warfare more remote—where drones can be flown from thousands of miles away and artillery can be fired without ever seeing the enemy—the signing of weapons reinforces the detachment from the brutal realities of war.

True peace cannot be achieved through violence. While military force may be necessary in some situations of self-defense or international intervention, it must

always be considered a last resort. Celebrating weapons, even as symbols of solidarity or resistance, distracts from the goal of diplomatic solutions that prioritize dialogue, negotiation, and mutual understanding. Long-term peace requires the dismantling of war as a normalized response to conflict and the promotion of policies that address the root causes of disputes—such as economic inequality, resource scarcity, and political disenfranchisement—through peaceful means.

The Role of Leaders

Leaders have a profound responsibility when it comes to war and peace. Their actions, words, and symbols set the tone for public perception and national policy. Leaders like Governor Josh Shapiro, who signed artillery shells in support of Ukraine, must recognize the power of their actions. While Shapiro's intention was likely to show solidarity with Ukraine's defense against Russian aggression, the ethical implications of such an act cannot be ignored. By participating in a ritual that personalizes weapons of war, leaders risk glorifying violence and distancing themselves from the moral responsibility to seek peace.

Leaders must carefully consider the symbolic weight of their actions, particularly in times of conflict. Rather than endorsing symbols of war, they should champion initiatives that promote peacebuilding and conflict resolution. This includes advocating for diplomatic talks, supporting humanitarian aid, and engaging in international cooperation to prevent conflicts from escalating into full-blown wars. The role of a leader is not only to defend their nation's interests but also to guide the global community toward a future where peace is the norm, not war.

Moreover, leaders are in a unique position to shift public perception. By refusing to participate in the glorification of war and instead promoting peace as the highest goal, they can influence societal attitudes toward conflict. When leaders emphasize the need for peaceful solutions, they foster a culture that prioritizes dialogue over violence, cooperation over confrontation.

Conclusion

The human costs of war are staggering, both in terms of immediate destruction and long-term societal trauma. The act of signing weapons, while symbolic, contributes to the normalization of violence and detracts from the pursuit of

peace. Leaders have a critical role in shaping the narrative around war and conflict. By rejecting symbols of destruction and embracing peacebuilding efforts, they can guide their nations—and the world—toward a future where war is no longer seen as an acceptable solution to human problems.

VI. Alternatives to Symbolism of War

The signing of weapons, though often intended as a morale booster or show of solidarity, risks normalizing violence and glorifying warfare. To create a more peaceful future, we must develop new symbols and actions that emphasize cooperation, diplomacy, and reconstruction over destruction. This section explores alternatives to violent symbolism, highlighting diplomacy, Pennsylvania's economic partnership with Zaporizhzhia, and the need for new, peaceful symbols to guide society through conflicts.

Diplomacy Over Destruction

The most effective alternative to the symbolism of war is the active pursuit of diplomatic solutions. Throughout history, wars have often been fought because diplomatic efforts either failed or were never fully pursued. Yet, diplomacy remains the most ethical and constructive way to resolve conflicts. Peaceful negotiations, international cooperation, and dialogue should be the first response to disputes between nations.

Diplomatic solutions, when successful, prevent the immense human suffering that accompanies war. They provide a forum for grievances to be aired and compromises to be made without resorting to violence. Historical examples such as the Camp David Accords or the Good Friday Agreement demonstrate that, although difficult and often imperfect, diplomacy can lead to lasting peace. In both cases, years of violence were curtailed by leaders willing to engage in open dialogue and compromise. Such efforts avoided further destruction and instead laid the groundwork for ongoing cooperation.

In the case of Ukraine, while military support is necessary for the nation’s defense, it is equally critical to pursue diplomatic solutions that can end the conflict. Supporting Ukraine should not be limited to supplying weapons but should also include fostering dialogue between conflicting parties and creating

opportunities for peaceful resolution. Diplomacy, in this context, serves as a foundation for sustainable peace, ensuring that the war does not perpetuate indefinitely and that the human cost is minimized.

Pennsylvania's Agreement with Zaporizhzhia

A practical example of supporting Ukraine without resorting to violent symbolism is Pennsylvania's partnership with the Zaporizhzhia region. Rather than focusing solely on military support, this agreement emphasizes economic cooperation, workforce development, and post-war rebuilding efforts. Under this agreement, Pennsylvania has committed to sharing expertise in industries such as energy, agriculture, and digital technologies, which are essential for Ukraine's recovery and long-term development.

This approach highlights a constructive alternative to signing weapons, focusing on collaboration that builds rather than destroys. Economic partnerships like this one empower regions to rebuild their infrastructure, strengthen their economies, and create opportunities for their citizens. Such initiatives are essential in conflict zones where war has decimated local economies and displaced thousands of people. By focusing on rebuilding, Pennsylvania's agreement shows how international support can help conflict-affected regions move toward peace and stability.

These efforts also foster long-term relationships between nations, reducing the likelihood of future conflicts. By investing in the reconstruction and development of war-torn areas, the international community can play a pivotal role in preventing the recurrence of violence and creating conditions for peace to flourish. Pennsylvania's partnership with Zaporizhzhia exemplifies how states and regions can contribute meaningfully to global peace efforts without relying on military symbols.

The Need for a New Symbolism

In a world that continues to grapple with conflict, there is an urgent need to replace outdated practices like signing weapons with new symbols that reflect cooperation, peace, and shared human values. These symbols should reject the glorification of war and instead embrace the principles of diplomacy, rebuilding,

and humanitarian support. Just as weapons can become symbols of destruction, new symbols can represent the collective effort to create a peaceful future.

One potential avenue for this new symbolism is the global peace movement, which uses various forms of art, literature, and public action to advocate for an end to violence. Symbols like the peace dove, olive branches, and peace signs have long represented the desire for global harmony. However, the modern era demands updated symbols that reflect current challenges and the complex nature of modern conflicts. For example, humanitarian aid packages, infrastructure rebuilding projects, and collaborative economic agreements like Pennsylvania's partnership with Zaporizhzhia can serve as symbols of international solidarity without the need for military imagery.

Additionally, leaders can create new forms of diplomatic rituals that focus on peace rather than war. For instance, the signing of peace treaties, joint declarations of cooperation, or the establishment of international humanitarian initiatives can become the new forms of symbolic acts that replace the personalization of weapons. Such acts not only send a message of unity but also promote real, tangible efforts to foster peace.

Creating and promoting these new symbols of peace requires a concerted effort from political leaders, civil society, and the international community. By focusing on what unites us—our shared humanity and desire for a better future—we can replace the outdated symbols of war with ones that inspire hope, cooperation, and peace.

Conclusion

Replacing the symbols of war, such as signing weapons, with alternatives that emphasize peace and cooperation is not only necessary but also possible. Diplomacy offers a constructive way to resolve conflicts, avoiding the immense human costs of war. Pennsylvania's partnership with Zaporizhzhia illustrates how economic collaboration and rebuilding efforts can replace militarized support with constructive, peaceful engagement. By embracing new symbols that reflect shared values of cooperation and peace, leaders and societies can shift the narrative from glorifying violence to fostering a future of global harmony.

VII. Conclusion

The Ethics of Symbolism in War

The act of signing weapons, though deeply rooted in the traditions of past conflicts, raises profound ethical questions in modern warfare. It represents a troubling paradox: while intended as a gesture of support or solidarity, it also contributes to the normalization and even glorification of violence. This practice, in effect, distances individuals from the destructive power these weapons wield, reducing tools of war to symbolic tokens, thereby obscuring their lethal purpose. By signing artillery shells or bombs, leaders and soldiers alike run the risk of trivializing the suffering and devastation that these instruments cause.

The ethical implications extend far beyond the individuals who engage in this practice. It reflects society's collective relationship with war, suggesting that violence can be personalized, ritualized, and even celebrated in certain contexts. Yet, this is inconsistent with the principles of human dignity, ethical governance, and the overarching goal of achieving peace. By turning war into a symbolic act, we risk losing sight of the real human cost it incurs—countless lives lost, communities shattered, and futures destroyed.

In our contemporary world, where wars are more visible than ever due to media coverage and global interconnectedness, it is crucial that we reject actions and symbols that glorify or normalize violence. The signing of weapons, while intended as a gesture of solidarity, ultimately perpetuates the idea that war is an acceptable and even honorable solution to conflict. It fails to acknowledge the full scope of human suffering that war entails and undermines efforts to build a world where peace is not only the goal but the default mode of interaction.

A Call for Peace

In light of these ethical considerations, it is imperative that political leaders, soldiers, and civilians alike turn away from symbols of violence and embrace paths that lead toward peace. War should always be seen as a last resort, a failure of diplomacy and dialogue rather than a solution in itself. As the world continues to grapple with conflicts, from Ukraine to other war-torn regions, we must prioritize diplomacy, cooperation, and humanitarian efforts over the glorification of military force.

Diplomatic solutions offer the only sustainable path toward lasting peace. By fostering dialogue, building international partnerships, and addressing the root causes of conflict—such as economic disparity, political instability, and resource competition—nations can work together to prevent violence before it escalates into full-scale war. Leaders, in particular, have a responsibility to reject symbols of destruction and instead promote symbols of peace, unity, and reconciliation.

The case of Pennsylvania's partnership with the Zaporizhzhia region illustrates how peaceful alternatives to war can be pursued. Economic cooperation and rebuilding efforts provide a constructive, forward-looking way to support nations in conflict without resorting to military intervention or violent symbolism. Such initiatives demonstrate the power of collaboration and the potential for peace to be achieved through non-violent means.

In conclusion, the ethical implications of signing weapons remind us of the urgent need to rethink our relationship with war and violence. Symbols matter, and the symbols we choose to promote—whether they are weapons of destruction or acts of peace—shape our collective understanding of conflict. By rejecting the practice of signing weapons and instead embracing symbols that celebrate peace and cooperation, we can move closer to a world where war is no longer glorified, and peace is prioritized above all else.

References

1. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. "Governor Shapiro Welcomes Ukrainian President Zelenskyy to Scranton Army Ammunition Plant, Signs Sister State Agreement with Zaporizhzhia, Ukraine." Pennsylvania Government Official Website, September 22, 2024.
   Available at: (Commonwealth of Pennsylvania)https://www.pa.gov/en/governor/newsroom/2024-press-releases/gov-shapiro-welcomes-ukrainian-pres-zelenskyy-scaap-signs-agreem.html).

2. MEAWW News(Meaww)Signs Artillery Shells for Ukraine, Blasted for 'Treating Weapons Like Sports Memorabilia.'"
   Available at: MEAWW News.

3. YouTube. "Pennsylvania Governor Signs Artillery Shells with Ukrainian President Zelenskyy." Video from Scranton Army Ammunition Plant visit, September 22, 2024.
   Available at: YouTube.

These sources provide detailed coverage of the event where Governor Shapiro signed artillery shells, the ethical discussions surrounding the act, and the broader geopolitical context.